

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)  
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com  
Joseph Margolies (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josephmargolies@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)  
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com  
Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)  
alyolson@quinnemanuel.com  
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)  
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com  
Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com  
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington D.C., 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

Jomaire Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

*Counsel for Defendant Google LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION**

CHASOM BROWN, *et al.*, individually and  
on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**GOOGLE LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL PORTIONS OF  
JOINT SUBMISSION RE:  
PRESERVATION IN LIGHT OF CLASS  
CERTIFICATION ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) respectfully seeks to seal certain portions of the parties’ Joint Submission Re: Preservation in Light of Class Certification Order (“Joint Submission”), which contains non-public, highly sensitive and confidential business information that could affect Google’s competitive standing and may expose Google to increased security risks if publicly disclosed, including details related to Google’s internal systems and processes, data fields, and metrics, which Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google’s competitors. This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in the Joint Submission:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
Joint Submission Re: Preservation in Light of Class Certification Order	Portions Highlighted in Blue at: Pages 3:26-27, 4:1, 4:3-5, 5:24, 6:2-3, 7:11	Google

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

A party seeking to seal material must “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

In the context of dispositive motions, materials may be sealed in the Ninth Circuit upon a showing that there are “compelling reasons” to seal the information. *See Kamakana v. City & Cty. Of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). However, a party seeking to seal information in a non-dispositive motion, such as the underlying motion, must show only “good cause.” *Id.* at 1179-80. The rationale for the lower standard with respect to non-dispositive motions is that “the public has less of a need for access to court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because these documents are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action”

1 and that as a result “[t]he public policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions, and  
 2 related materials, do not apply with equal force to non-dispositive materials.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d  
 3 at 1179; *see also TVIIM, LLC v. McAfee, Inc.*, 2015 WL 5116721, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015)  
 4 (“Records attached to nondispositive motions are not subject to the strong presumption of access.”)  
 5 (citation omitted). Under the “good cause” standard, courts will seal statements reporting on a  
 6 company’s users, sales, investments, or other information that is ordinarily kept secret for  
 7 competitive purposes. *See Hanginout, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 2014 WL 1234499, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. Mar.  
 8 24, 2014); *Nitride Semiconductors Co. v. RayVio Corp.*, 2018 WL 10701873, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Aug.  
 9 1, 2018) (granting motion to seal “[c]onfidential and proprietary information regarding  
 10 [Defendant]’s products” under “good cause” standard) (Van Keulen, J.). Although the materials that  
 11 Google seeks to seal here easily meet the higher “compelling reasons” standard, the Court need only  
 12 consider whether these materials meet the lower “good cause” standard because the underlying  
 13 motion is not dispositive.

### 14 **III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS SHOULD ALL BE SEALED**

15 Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business  
 16 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*,  
 17 435 U.S. 589, 589-99 (1978). Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that  
 18 “contain[] confidential information about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public  
 19 disclosure could harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg of*  
 20 *Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that  
 21 could harm a litigant’s competitive standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons”  
 22 standard. *See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at  
 23 \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015) (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’  
 24 standard where that information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”)  
 25 (citation omitted). Courts in this district have also determined that motions to seal may be granted  
 26 as to potential trade secrets. *See, e.g. United Tactical Sys., LLC v. Real Action Paintball, Inc.*, 2015  
 27 WL 295584, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2015) (rejecting argument against sealing “that [the party]  
 28 ha[s] not shown that the substance of the information . . . amounts to a trade secret”).

1 Here, the Joint Submission comprises confidential and proprietary information regarding  
2 highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share  
3 publicly. Specifically, this information provides details related to Google’s internal data storage,  
4 metrics, and fields. Such information reveals Google’s internal strategies, system designs, and  
5 business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services while complying  
6 with its legal and privacy obligations.

7 Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing  
8 it has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of  
9 Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, and designs to Google’s competitors. That alone is a proper  
10 basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02329-  
11 BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal certain  
12 sensitive business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the integrity and  
13 security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-  
14 02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because  
15 “disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have”);  
16 *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at \*8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting  
17 motion to seal as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publicly  
18 available”).

19 Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to  
20 compromise Google’s infrastructure. Google would be placed at an increased risk of cyber security  
21 threats. *See, e.g., In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25,  
22 2013) (sealing “material concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects how  
23 messages are transmitted” because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the  
24 Gmail system”). The security threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified  
25 information.

26 The information Google seeks to redact, including details related Google’s internal projects,  
27 internal databases, and their proprietary functionalities, is the minimal amount of information  
28 needed to protect its internal systems and operations from being exposed to not only its competitors

1 but also to nefarious actors who may improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and  
 2 operations. The “good cause” rather than the “compelling reasons” standard should apply but under  
 3 either standard, Google’s sealing request is warranted.

#### 4 **IV. CONCLUSION**

5 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should seal the identified portions of the Joint  
 6 Submission.

8 DATED: January 6, 2023

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
 SULLIVAN, LLP

By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

10 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
 11 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
 Chicago, IL 60606  
 Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

14 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
 stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
 15 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
 violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
 16 Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971)  
 crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com  
 17 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
 Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

20 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
 21 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

24 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
 25 1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900  
 Washington, D.C. 20005  
 Telephone: 202-538-8000  
 Facsimile: 202-538-8100

28 Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com

1 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
2 New York, NY 10010  
3 Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
4 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

5 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
6 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
7 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
8 San Francisco, CA 94111  
9 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
10 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

11 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28